

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/475,963	12/30/1999	ROGER L. BUIS	BO999023-003	7122 -	
8791	7590 12/05/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD			LUDWIG, M	LUDWIG, MATTHEW J	
SEVENTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANGEL	ES, CA 90025-1030		2178		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/475,963	BUIS ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Matthew J. Ludwig	2178			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 16(a). In no event, however, may a re- rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 Oc	ctober 2006.				
	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ace except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the merits	is		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 10-16,24 and 26-31 is/are pending in	the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>10-16, 24, 26-31</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers			•		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	ion is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121	(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	·				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
	,				
		•			
Attachment(s)		,			
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948))/Mail Date formal Patent Application			
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	—·			

Application/Control Number: 09/475,963

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This action is in response to the RCE filed 10/19/2006.
- 2. Claims 10-16, 24, and 26-31, are pending in the case. Claims 10 and 24 are independent claims.
- 3. Claims 10-16, 24, and 26-31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umen et al., USPN 6,854,086 filed (11/13/02) have been removed pursuant to applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 10-16, 24, and 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umen et al., USPN 6,854,086 filed (11/13/02) in view of Shoup et al., USPN 7,076,502 filed (4/12/2004).

In reference to independent claim 10, Umen teaches:

Section headings may be included in the document templates for identifying the various sections of each document. At each location within the document template where a data object is to be retrieved from the clinical study data base, there is a control code identifying which object is to be retrieved (compare to "associating an identifier with each record in a data stream at a

Application/Control Number: 09/475,963

Art Unit: 2178

first computer, the identifier indicating a type of information included within a data record").

See column 17, lines 20-35.

Each of the document templates specifies the type and order of data objects that are to be retrieved from the clinical study database in order to produce a standard drug document in accordance with FDA, EU, Company, or other predetermined document formats. Table 1 lists representative study details that may be specified within representative standard types of documents (compare to "associating each identifier with a format region, each format region defining an area on a document page"). See column 10, lines 35-55.

When the user selects Document Generation from the main menu, the DMUI provides a series of study selection menus which allow the user to specify whether the desired document pertains to a single study or whether the desired document integrates data from more than one study, and to select the study of interest (compare to "specifying parameters for each format region, where the parameters include formatting instructions relating to the presentation of the data records in a document at a second computer"). See column 17, lines 33-67. The reference fails to explicitly state the parameter are directly related to a format region; however, the parameters selected by the user for specifying dates of studies suggests the placement of data into specific regions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the parameters and predefined templates for the transmitting of document layouts effecting specific document regions for production of a standard drug document in accordance with FDA, EU, Company, or other predetermined document formats.

When the DMUI has completed generating the document, the document can be provided to the word processor for any desired editing or refinement by the user (compare to "formatting")

each data record within the corresponding format region according to the parameters specified at the second computer"). See column 19, lines 25-45.

The Umen reference discloses templates used for specifying the arrangement of information within a particular type of document to be generated. The generated drug data is presented to a user in a specific format based upon a reviewer of the data. A developer may also wish to produce internal company reports which may also present the same drug data in another customized format. Umen fails to explicitly state layout identifiers controlling placement of each data within each format region. However, Shoup teaches a record management system for generating a multi-dimensional view for different measures. A set of records is retrieved in response to a set of queries. More specifically, a layout engine designates specific data into specific regions of the document based upon formatting parameters. See column 16, lines 30-67 and column 17, lines 45-67. Once the formatting information is gathered, the record management system proceeds with the generation of a layout mapping. The layout engine builds the layout mapping in the layout mapping storage unit by utilizing the retrieved formatting information and the record structure foundation formed by the query map and master table index. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Umen and Shoup before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the data formatting methods of Umen and added the layout engine of Shoup, because it would have given the user an added multidimensional view of information based upon formatting instructions.

In reference to dependent claim 11, Umen teaches:

When the DMUI has completed generating the document, the document can be provided to the word processor for any desired editing or refinement by the user. Additionally, the user

Art Unit: 2178

may then instruct the word processor to operate the printer for printing the generated document. See column 19, lines 35-45.

In reference to dependent claim 12 and 13, Umen teaches:

The Umen reference discloses templates used for specifying the arrangement of information within a particular type of document to be generated. The generated drug data is presented to a user in a specific format based upon a reviewer of the data. A developer may also wish to produce internal company reports which may also present the same drug data in another customized format. Umen fails to explicitly state layout identifiers controlling placement of each data within each format region. However, Shoup teaches a record management system for generating a multi-dimensional view for different measures. A set of records is retrieved in response to a set of queries. More specifically, a layout engine designates specific data into specific regions of the document based upon formatting parameters. Once the formatting information is gathered, the record management system proceeds with the generation of a layout mapping. The layout engine builds the layout mapping in the layout mapping storage unit by utilizing the retrieved formatting information and the record structure foundation formed by the query map and master table index. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Umen and Shoup before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the data formatting methods of Umen and added the layout engine of Shoup, because it would have given the user an added multi-dimensional view of information based upon formatting instructions.

Application/Control Number: 09/475,963

Art Unit: 2178

In reference to dependent claim 14-16, Umen teaches:

The document generation option of the main menu provides access to procedures for generating drug documents on the basis of pre-defined document templates and information contained within the clinical study database. Each of the document templates specifies the type and order of data objects that are to be retrieved from the clinical study database in order to produce a standard drug document. The reference fails to explicitly state each data record formatted within a format region of a first type repeated at the beginning of each page of the document. However, Shoup teaches a record management system for generating a multidimensional view for different measures. A set of records is retrieved in response to a set of queries. More specifically, a layout engine designates specific data into specific regions of the document based upon formatting parameters. Once the formatting information is gathered, the record management system proceeds with the generation of a layout mapping. The layout engine builds the layout mapping in the layout mapping storage unit by utilizing the retrieved formatting information and the record structure foundation formed by the query map and master table index. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Umen and Shoup before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the data formatting methods of Umen and added the layout engine of Shoup, because it would have given the user an added multi-dimensional view of information based upon formatting instructions.

In reference to claims 24, and 26-31, the claims reflect the computer program instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in 10-16. In further view of the following, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Page 7

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-16, 24, and 26-31, have been considered, but are most in view of the new grounds of rejections

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML

STEPHEN HONG

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER